DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 339 FL 012 533

AUTHOR Madsen, Harold S.; Bowen, J. Donald
TITLE Evaluating Contemporary Language-Teaching Methodologies through Historical Perspective.
PUB DATE [81]
NOTE 21p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational History; Evaluation; Instructional Innovation; *Second Language Instruction; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

The comparative study of foreign language teaching methodologies benefits from an overview of the history of foreign language instruction, which begins with Roman youths learning Greek and, later, the classical form of Latin. In the Middle Ages and Renaissance, notable figures such as Erasmus and Montaigne espoused highly intensive though relatively unsystematic methods, though it was in this period that the love for the discipline of a grammatical system brought the grammar translation method into favor. By the end of the 19th century, the Natural and Phonetic Methods, reactions to grammar translation, had spawned the oral-aural Direct Method. The eclectic and thoroughly worked-out views of a figure such as Harold E. Palmer (1877-1949) sound remarkably modern. The recurring ideas of contemporary methodologies are also recurring ideas of history (e.g., starting instruction at an early age). Both the success of the audiolingual approach and the views of its contemporary detractors can be understood through historical perspective. The many innovative methods currently in use (including Total Physical Response and the Silent Way) also owe their distinctive appeal to one or more time-honored principles of foreign language instruction. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Harold S. Madsen,
J. Donald Bowen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED207339

Evaluating Contemporary Language-Teaching Methodologies Through Historical Perspective

Harold S. Madsen
J. Donald Bowen

The march of man's technological progress over the ages has essentially been a steady one, with the accumulation of knowledge opening doors to a fuller understanding of the world, its inhabitants, and other activities.

There are exceptions: The Egyptians forgot how to make papyrus, and the secret was lost for more than a thousand years. It was recently rediscovered and once again is being produced in the Nile Valley. The zenith in the manufacture of fine musical instruments was reached by a craftsman from Cremona, Italy named Antonio Stradivari, who lived from 1644 to 1737, and whose violins are still without peer nearly 300 years later. The secret of his skill died with him and has not yet been rediscovered. But these are exceptions to the general rule that man has been able to build on his past technological accomplishments. Sir Isaac Newton certainly had this principle in mind when he said, "If I have seen further than others it is because I have stood on the shoulders of giants."

By contrast, progress in the social sciences has been far from even. Language teaching, for example, is certainly a compelling example of a community of scholars generally too busy to do their homework. As they busily generate new ideas, techniques, procedures and applications, they give new life to that most tired of cliches, the one about re-inventing the wheel.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

FL 012 533

Among the compelling reasons to acquire an historical perspective is to avoid the latest restrictive polarization. A leading psychologist has lamented that

> so many people insist on being pro-Freudian or anti-Freudian, pro-scientific (behaviorist) or anti-scientific (cognitive), etc. In my opini n all such loyalty-positions are silly. Our job is to integrate these various truths into the whole truth, which should be our only loyalty (Maslow 1970).

In a landmark address to TESOL in 1971, John Carroll warned the profession of the same problem:

> Our field has been afflicted, I think, with many false dichotomies, irrelevant oppositions, weak conceptualizations, and neglect of the really critical issues and variables. When I summarized two extreme points of view in language teaching as being first the 'audiolingual habit theory' and second 'the cognitive-code learning theory,' I had no real intention of pitting one against the other. I was only interested in pursuing what each theory would imply if pushed to the limit. Indeed, even at that time I meant to suggest that each theory had a modicum of truth and that some synthesis needed to be worked out. Instead, the trend has been for points of view to become crystallized and polarized (Carroll 1971:102).

Other dichotomies come to mind: the issue of contrastive analysis versus error analysis, delayed versus immediate oral response in a second-language course, the use or avoidance of translation (or even of the vernacular); implementation of a grammatical, situational, or notional syllabus.

A related matter which an improved historical perspective promises help in coping with is the notion that "newer is better," and that accepting one method

implies an automatic rejection of all that preceded it. As a result, innovation is often sought for its own sake. This longstanding bias in favor of newness is one of the key reasons we have failed to enjoy significant cumulative development in the profession.

Brief Historical Survey of Language Teaching Methods

References to language methodologies of the past often seem intended to serve as foil for today's innovation. It is fashionable to criticize the "mindless pattern drills" in yesterday's audio-lingual approach, or to smile condescendingly at the quaint notion from the nineteenth century of "exercising one's mental faculties" through rigorous grammar-translation instruction. In retrospect, the shortcomings of various earlier methodologies are quite obvious, just as those of today's methods will certainly be to subsequent generations. The purpose of this overview, then, is not to review the failings of past language-teaching practices. Rather it is to identify those robust procedures recurring over the centuries that can serve as touchstones in evaluating contemporary methodologies. This brief discussion can of course illustrate only a few of these procedures.[1]

---

[1]For a fuller treatment see references to this article and Bowen, J. Donald; Madsen, Harold S. and Hilferty, Ann. TESOL Techniques and Procedures (in preparation).

Turning to ancient Rome, we find that Greek was studied by Roman youth as early as the second century B.C. When the child was very young, instruction was provided informally by Greek nurses, slaves, and tutors in the relaxed atmosphere of the home. (This seemed logical to the Romans since prior to 300 B.C., they had no formal schools and for a considerable time, literacy,

numeracy, and morality were taught by the father in the home.) After years of immersion in the target language, children entered school, fluent in both Greek and Latin. Special texts (the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana) provided vocabulary that was organized semantically under various topics, as well as simple narratives and conversational readings. Notice how natural the exchanges are in this early dialog that provides practice in question forms:

> The paterfamilias moves toward his friend and says,
>
> 'Good morning, Caius', and he embraces him.
>
> The latter returns the greeting and says,
>
> 'Nice to meet you. Would you like to come along?'
>
> 'Where?'
>
> 'To see our friend Lucius. We are going to pay him a visit.'
>
> 'What's the matter with him?'
>
> 'He's sick.'
>
> 'Since when?'
>
> 'Since a few days ago.'
>
> 'Where does he live?'
>
> 'Not very far from here. If you like we can go there.'
>
> (Titone, 1968:7).

Later, during the Medieval period, we can see the logic and practicality that provided second-language instruction in the new international language, Latin. In Romance countries, for example, one learned the vernacular at home, followed by a systematic study in school of its classical sister form, Latin. Instruction was largely oral, since mechanically printed texts were not yet available. This complemented subsequent studies in rhetoric, which was undergirded by a thorough understanding of grammar. And writing skills were developed with reference to well-written prose similar to that which students

would ultimately have to produce themselves. Second-language instruction had twin practical objectives: preparing students to function in school where Latin was the medium, and enabling them to function in their profession.

A significant development in the Renaissance was the reaction of certain important scholars against stultifying language teaching practices. Very prominent among this group was the eminent Dutch scholar, Erasmus. He held that the system of the target language could be discovered inductively through exposure to discourse. He advocated that Latin be learned during childhood, preferably at home with a private teacher, and he would defer grammar until the student could speak the language. He also advocated learning the language through exposure to interesting and practical conversation and stories accompanied by pictures. Erasmus viewed grammar and rhetoric merely as means and not ends. Grammar rules, reserved for advanced work, would be disclosed only with accompanying examples and after each grammar point had been learned in context. His recommended three stages of language instruction began with informal conversation, naming, and describing; the second stage continued the conversational emphasis using stories based on history, mythology, and domestic subjects; descriptions using pictures enabled students to increase their vocabulary without using translation; grammar was limited and accompanied by simple examples. The third stage gave reading increased emphasis, in part to exemplify excellence; grammar received more attention now but was always subordinated to language use.

It was the Frenchman Montaigne that provided a dramatic example of the contrast between a newly espoused direct approach and the formalized procedures of the day. He indicated that his father provided a Latin tutor for him; and up to the time he was six, his parents and even the servants conversed with him solely in Latin. At this age he knew no French, but his Latin was so nearly

perfect that scholars were reluctant to attempt any improvement. And this was achieved, said Montaigne, "without books, rules or grammar, without whipping or whining" (Newmark 1948:3). He then enrolled in one of the most prominent classical schools in France, the College de Guyenne; in studying Latin here, it was not long, he said, before he was unable to speak it at all.

Comenius, the most influential educator of the seventeenth century, elaborated over the years a remarkable approach to language teaching which included a systematic, graded presentation of syntax, inductive instruction in grammar, and lexical mastery through controlled vocabulary and visual association. In his language texts he stressed that an understanding of the subject content must parallel one's mastery of linguistic forms. He helped to insure this further in his 1657 text, The World in Pictures, which associated drawings with related texts.

The eighteenth century witnessed the demise of Latin as the medium of instruction; grammar became important in its own right for the supposed intellectual stimulation it provided, and seventeenth-century translation techniques continued to be popular during this Age of Reason. Various reformers in France strived to improve language teaching methods, and in Germany Johann Basedow founded a unique teacher training institution and model school. He advocated using interesting reading selections, visual aids, conversation, role play, and games.

While the roots of Grammar-Translation are clearly visible in the eighteenth century and even much earlier, this approach did not become full blown until the early decades of the nineteenth century. The widespread availability of textbooks and increasing enrollment in language classes contributed to the acceptance of Grammar-Translation. This "cognitive" approach was easy for the teacher to use. Classes could be taught in the students'

native language, with little teaching skill or foreign-language speaking skill needed by the instructor. Objectives were limited and attainable. At the same time, proponents took pride in the intellectual rigor of the approach as well as the esthetic satisfaction that was seen to stem from beautifully written texts which students were exposed to. Principal limitations were tedium, inefficiency of instruction, and limited results in terms of communication--notably, limited oral proficiency.

The excesses of Grammar-Translation began to spark reactions which collectively came to be known as the Natural Method movement. Since children learn "naturally" to speak before they read, some recommended that oracy precede literacy and that passive skills precede active ones. Natural Methodists tended to avoid the use of books in class. Like children in the home, students were to be immersed in language and allowed to formulate their own generalizations. Most felt that the age of the student was immaterial, all persons learning the same way regardless of age or educational background. Activity, games and demonstration were advocated to enhance motivation and understanding.

Forerunners of the Natural Method movement, including Lemare, Dufief, and Payne, emphasized induction and self reliance. Later, Claude Marcel recommended student initiative in language learning through an inductive approach. His system essentially rejected all formal systematic use of grammar instruction. And the involvement-focussed conversational instruction of the Frenchman Francois Gouin involved students actively in doing what they spoke about, first in their native language and then in the target language.

But while proponents of "nature's way" offered a serious challenge to advocates of Grammar-Translation, they encountered difficulties of their own: their lack of system, their lack of textbooks, the heavy demands on teachers to create their own teaching procedures, the linguistic proficiency needed by

language instructors, coupled with criticism of "showmanship" began to blunt their efforts.

At this time, however, the Phonetic (or structural) Method emerged, and the anti-Grammar-Translation movement gathered momentum. Enjoying the weight of linguistic authority, the Phonetic Method provided careful systematic instruction lacking in the Natural Method. Beginning instruction was principally oral and essentially limited to the target language. Besides abundant phonological drill, the method employed visuals very extensively, particularly to help immerse students in the new culture. Oral and written composition topics were based on conversation or reading material previously covered in class. The most advanced study consisted of grammar and translation work.

By the turn of the century the Natural and Phonetic Methods had spawned instruction that came to be known as the Direct Method. Supporters tended to favor an incubation period of listening prior to speaking, and quite generally the teaching of passive skills prior to active skills. Speech, not writing, was viewed as the basis of language. A strict oral-aural approach was used at beginning levels with oral readings introduced later on. And contrastive analysis began to be emphasized. While some disapproved, others allowed books to be used with caution. Also, while some saw the value of occasional grammatical explanations, most vehemently rejected such practice. Unlike many of their Natural Method predecessors, they began to favor graded sequencing of materials from easy to difficult. They agreed that language was a skill or habit. Its social application made an awareness of culture important. Rejecting the Natural Methodists' claim that young and old learn the same way, Direct Methodists favored modifying their teaching approaches according to the age or background of students.

At this time, linguistic and methodological contributions by a number of persons hastened the decline of Grammar-Translation.[2] These included such major figures as Henry Sweet, Harold Palmer, Walter Ripman, and Michael West in England, Leonard Bloomfield and Otto Jespersen in the United States, Adolf Bohlen in Germany, and Francois Closset in Belgium. Because the early twentieth century teaching "Reform" was a broad movement rather than a rigid, narrowly defined method, the approaches advanced by these leaders overlapped but not necessarily coincided with mainstream Direct Method principles and techniques.

In concluding our historical overview, we will survey the remarkably contemporary-sounding tenets of just one of these persons--Harold Palmer.[3]

---

[2] But Grammar-Translation was still one of the two dominant methodologies at the outbreak of World War II. The other was the Direct Method.

---

[3] British methodologist Harold E. Palmer (1877-1949) tapped several of the methods of his day. He felt that language teachers needed training in all branches of linguistics and not simply in phonetics, as many Direct Method proponents advocated. He developed his own phonetic and syntactic systems and also gave attention to semantics.

Although he saw the necessity for a rational, systematic approach to language teaching, he championed a careful eclecticism which would facilitate the learning of persons differing in age, temperament, and language background. His "multiple line of approach" rejected allegiance to any one theory as well as the notion that inherent conflicts exist between methods. For him, the "complete" method included any teaching practice except "bad" ones; this perspective enabled teachers to draw upon multiple techniques or needed pedagogical improvements in order to accomplish their task. He compared the exaggerated

claims of some narrowly-defined methods with those of patent medicine vendors and their cure-all claims.

Unlike Natural Methodists, he was not satisfied with an intuitive approach. Theoretical underpinning for language teaching should be provided by linguistics, psychology, and pedagogical principles. Palmer advocated teaching receptive skills up to three months before requiring students to speak. He felt students should be provided with appropriate learning strategies and systematic language practice. He showed how to utilize multiple avenues to convey meaning (such as "spatialization" where language is illuminated through actions and objects, context, definition, and even translation); he advocated using vernacular explanations; he explained how to use pattern drills and substitution tables; and he taught how to capitalize on the difference between intensive and extensive readings--a distinction thought to be original with Palmer. A giant in his day, Palmer turned out over 100 publications, helped refine and broaden the Direct Method, and had a major influence on language teaching, internationally.

Evaluating Contemporary Methods

With the foregoing brief outline of methods employed in the past, we have at least a few touchstones for evaluating contemporary methodologies. Sifting though these various approaches, we find a number of recurring ideas: starting language instruction young--in early childhood and with native speakers if possible; providing immersion classes; using an oral approach; insisting on language material being provided in context; using dialogs and natural speech; providing semantically organized, contemporary vocabulary; incorporating paraphrase as a learning activity; arranging for contextualized instruction and an inductive approach to grammar; using pictures and other visual aids;

providing interesting, relevant material; planning graded, sequenced instruction; arranging for different approaches and content at varying levels of instruction; allowing the use of translation; providing cultural understanding; providing active physical involvement; and encouraging self-reliance. Over the ages, the successful implementation of these principles and techniques have provided them an implicit sanction that suggests the likelihood of their success in the future. At the same time, we see that successful approaches have avoided the formalism so prevalent during the Medieval Period and the Renaissance; and have encompassed a variety of procedures to accommodate students of various ages, proficiency levels, and backgrounds.

The Audio-lingual Approach. Despite widespread interest for well over a decade in newer "cognitive" instruction, eclecticism, and Europe's notional-functional syllabus, varying forms of the audio-lingual approach enjoy rather wide acceptance. Using historical comparisons we can account in large measure for its vitality and success. Like the earlier Phonetic Method, it enjoyed great prestige almost from the beginning with the virtual unanimous support it had from linguists, psychologists, teachers, and the public at large. Secondly, it was accompanied by carefully-prepared materials--an advantage enjoyed by Grammar-Translation teachers but not Natural Method instructors. It incorporated well-planned sequencing as advocated by Comenius, Direct Methodists and others. It featured an oral emphasis, repeatedly recommended from the classical period to the present. Like almost all vital antecedents it was skill oriented. Contextualized language practice was provided as recommended by Erasmus and others; this included dialogue, which appeared as early as the Roman period. Audio-lingual teachers also used a wide variety of activities to help maintain interest, just as Basedow and Gouin had recommended. We remember

Comenius' picture-book approach as we recall the extensive use of visuals during the Audio-lingual era. Another feature that characterized the early A-L movement was immersion, as enjoyed by Montaigne and Roman youth. When immersion was not feasible, teachers compensated by providing abundant practice, advocated by greats like Erasmus.

But there were heavy demands on the teacher, a feature which had threatened the Natural Method. Like the conceptual flaw in Grammar-translation of exercising mental faculties through rigorous grammar drill, Audio-lingual notions of language as habit and the value of "overlearning" led some to excesses in drill. Henry Sweet, a brilliant contemporary of Palmer, had recognized the need for ample language practice, but cautioned that drill be used judiciously so as not to cause boredom. And while skillful A-L practitioners employed an ingenious array of techniques to convey meaning, others mesmerized by the "habit" notion inundated students with disconnected sentences exemplifying a given structural pattern. Finally, there were those who seemed so fascinated by structural linguist activities such as contrastive analysis and language description that their instruction became dominated by the formal aspects of language. The stultifying results have historical antecedents, for example in the later Medieval period and during the Grammar-translation era in the nineteenth century.

In short, the success of the Audio-lingual movement can be attributed to an impressive array of historically-tested procedures. Similarly, contemporary criticism of the approach can likewise be understood by utilizing historical perspective.

A fairly extensive array of historical insights has been applied to the Audio-Lingual approach since it is so widely known. A briefer evaluation will be made of several methods that have been advanced during the past decade.

Methods Featuring One Dominant Procedure. The ease with which nonnative teachers can use the St. Cloud[4] Method recalls a similar advantage enjoyed by

[4]Cuyer 1972; and see Schumann 1972 for a discussion of St. Cloud and other methods not widely known in TESL circles; Madsen 1979 describes the methods evaluated here.

grammar-translation teachers. (Of course ease of instruction does not necessarily insure effective teaching.) The abundant use of film strips and movies recalls the injunctions of Comenius in particular but also of Erasmus, Basedow, and advocates of the Phonetic Method. Meaning is certainly enhanced through the media used. Cultural insights constitute an integral element of St. Cloud; this has historical precedents in the Direct Method and other approaches. Likewise, the method's abundant student practice is a time-tested feature. There is limited opportunity, however, for the student initiative recommended by Palmer and others.

James J. Asher's Total Physical Response provides the incubation period recommended by Palmer and Direct Methodists. Along with this is the reduction in anxiety aimed for by a number of language teaching scholars of the past. The activity orientation aids meaning and seems to spur interest and motivation, notably at early levels of instruction.[5] Gouin in particular, but also Basedow

[5]Eugene J. Hall's Situatioral Reinforcement Method also involves students in active physical responses relating to what they discuss. Even more than TPR, it rejects grammar-oriented instruction.

and others, promoted activity as a valuable adjunct to language learning.

Harris Winitz' Comprension Method (copyrighted as The Learnables) also

provides an incubation period prior to speaking. Along with this is a constant visual presentation that enhances interest and meaning; again Comenius and Direct Method teachers offer historical support for the practice. Like Asher's TPR, the Winitz procedure avoids a "structural syllabus"; this calls to mind the inductive approach of Erasmus, but even more the intuitive procedure used in the Natural Method and the grammar-free early instruction of Montaigne and Roman youth.

The most compelling feature of the Microwave "method" is the relevant, practical conversation utilized, together with immediate application; the work of Erasmus and the procedure utilized in the Natural Method corroborate the value of such instruction.

But each of these methods, particularly the last three, is missing a characteristic found in successful methods throughout the centuries: That is the variety of procedures necessary to enable teachers to present all four skills at all levels to students of varying ages and backgrounds. This does not suggest that any one of the procedures is flawed. On the contrary. Each is well conceived and well supported historically. It simply means that several are too limited in scope to qualify as "methods." They seem well suited to handle part of language teaching. Coupled with other procedures, they hold promise of getting the whole job done.

Three prominent methods. We will conclude with a look at three rather prominent contemporary methods: Georgi Lozanov's Suggestology, Caleb Gattegno's Silent Way, and Charles Curran's Counseling Learning.

Various figures throughout the ages have been concerned with allaying the anxiety and frustration often associated with learning a second language. Quintilian (35-95 A.D.) recommended pleasant, interesting material such as an Aesop fable; Erasmus, like the Romans, would have the foreign language begun in

the non-threatening atmosphere of the home; John Locke likewise suggested that the second language be "talked into" a child in an easy, natural way. A principal characteristic of Suggestology reflects these concerns that anxiety be eliminated from the language class. Also a conscious effort is made to build confidence in the teacher and to create a prestigious image of the method, as was enjoyed by the Audio-lingual approach in its hey day and the earlier Phonetic Method. Like the Romans and countless others, students use dialogue, not to mention music and the arts. As Claude Marcel did in the nineteenth century, Suggestology encourages student initiative. In the early decades of this century critics were impressed with the fluency of many students taught by the Direct Method, but there was concern for their lack of accuracy. The same observation has been made about students taught by Suggestology. And as Natural Method teachers often failed to achieve the pinnacles of success described by those who championed that method, Suggestology has been severely criticized for some of its inflated promises (Scovel 1979).

As we have seen, forerunners of the Natural Method as well as others advocated induction and self-reliance on the part of students. The Silent Way utilizes these principles, by dramatically reducing teacher input, providing opportunity for reflection and the freedom to err. The principle of self-reliance is enhanced too by ostensibly reducing teacher dominance in the class. Like all contemporary methods, the historically accepted oral approach is used, along with selected realia and charts, the latter being recommended at least since the time of Erasmus. While the teacher has some flexibility, for example in presenting structural concepts through the use of rods, Silent Way like Suggestology is a closed system, rather tightly prescribed, and more disinclined to accept additions or modifications than many historical approaches have been.

Less teacher dominated than any other contemporary method, Counseling

Learning has as a central concept the need for student initiative in language learning. In this, it reflects the Natural Method and particularly the thinking of Marcel. Like the Silent Way, this method calls for the cooperation and mutual help of students. The role of the instructor (or "knower") is dramatically altered; and the student of historical methods racalls language teachers of the past, who were slaves, servants, parents and private tutors. The seemingly unstructured exchanges between students bring to mind the rather unstructured Natural Method or home instruction that we have discussed. And free to discuss whatever is on their minds, students are able to achieve the relevance so often advocated in the history of language teaching. But this seeming lack of system does not appeal to everyone. Historically an unstructured approach seems to have been used most frequently and successfully for conversational mastery of the language, particularly (but not exclusively) with young persons. Natural Method concepts seemed to be more widely accepted in the systematized guise of the Phonetic or Direct Methods.

It will be noted that this evaluation based on historical insights has not resulted in an overall pass-fail assessment. While a total impression is inevitable, procedures are evaluated individually, allowing for acceptance or rejection of any element incorporated in the method. This enables us to retain useful segments rather than jettisoning the entire method as has so often been the case in the past.

The three methods just examined are well developed and generally acceptable from an historical perspective. Of interest, however, are occasional reports that no one of them is suitable for every language teaching situation (LaForge 1971; Madsen 1979). This should not be surprising; but somehow it is disquieting to those attempting to find the "one best method." Many of the concepts enunciated in the monumental Report of the Committee of Twelve, are as

relevant today as they were in 1900 when the document first appeared. One of the conclusions declared that no single method is superior to all others. It was deemed advisable to select a teaching approach compatible with a student's age and the goals of instruction. After surveying over twenty centuries of foreign language instruction, Kelly concluded that "very few inherently bad ideas have ever been put forward in language teaching" (Kelly 1969:363). To the extent this is true, historical evaluation can aid us in selecting sound procedures appropriate for our needs and congruent with out philosophical orientation and teaching style. (Not to be overlooked of course is the fact that method is by no means the sole ingredient in the language teaching process (Carroll 1971:113; Stevick 1976:91-97).

It seems to us highly probable that an improved historical perspective could enable us to evaluate and retain useful components of a method rather than abandon it completely as has occurred in the past. We find it encouraging that following the apex of Audio-lingualism there has been a tendency to retain sound practices from this approach (such as the oral focus, activities, variety, visuals, etc.) while sloughing off practices that had come under criticism (extensive memorization, lengthy pattern drill--especially phonological--uncontextualized practice and the like). As Palmer or Sweet would have recommended, there is a simultaneous inclination to graft in useful procedures from new methodologies and movements: tolerance of some errors, more realistic and contextualized practice, increased student initiative and decreased teacher domination, communicative activities even in early stages of instruction, and a conscious affective ingredient.

In short, acquiring historical perspective holds the promise of aiding our achievement of a judicious eclecticism. But it can take us even a step even beyond eclecticism, a direction we seem to be headed in at this very time.

Almost unawares we seem to be on the verge of accepting a methodological pluralism. We speak of cognitive methods, Notional Syllabuses, and English for Specific Purposes--all in the plural. With little fanfare of debate, we seem to be recognizing that varying situations call for differing approaches. By not labeling the variant forms of cognitive methodology, we can modify them without the trauma associated with changing or abandoning a method. This compares with parting from a friend as contrasted with abandoning a spouse. Complementing this pluralism is a healthy tendency to accept practical and theoretically sound practices from any new methodology.

Our hope for the future is that historically well informed and well trained professionals in our discipline will be increasingly inclined to accept and utilize valuable insights from the past as well as from our burgeoning present-day resources. By doing so, we will at last be able to enjoy the cumulative development that we have denied ourselves for so long.

REFERENCES

Asher, James J. 1977. Learning Another Language through Actions: The Complete Teacher's Guidebook. Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oak Productions.

Bowen, J. Donald; Madsen, Harold S.; Hilferfy, Ann. TESOL Techniques and Procedures. (Forthcoming)

Brooks, Nelson. 1975. "The meaning of audiolingual." Modern Language Journal 59, 5-6: 234-240.

Carroll, John B. 1971. "Current Issues in Psycholinguistics and Second Language Teaching." TESOL Quarterly 5, 2: 101-114.

Cummings, Thomas. 1916. How to Learn a Foreign Language. Privately published.

Curran, Charles A. 1972. Counseling-Learning: A Whole-Person Model for Education. New York: Grune and Stratton.

Curran, Charles A. 1976. Counseling Learning in Second Languages. Apple River, Ill.: Apple River Press.

Cuyer, Andre. 1972. "The Saint-Cloud Method: What it can and cannot achieve," English Language Teaching 27: 19-24.

Darian, Steven G. 1972. English as a foreign language. History, development and methods of teaching. Norman Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.

Diller, Karl C. 1978. The Language Teaching Controversy. Rowley, Massachussets: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Gattegno, Caleb. 1972/2nd edition. Teaching Foreign Languages in Schools: the Silent Way. New York: Educational Solutions.

Gattegno, Caleb. 1976. The Common Sense of Teaching Foreign Languages. New York: Educational Solutions, Inc.

Hall, Eugene J., and Sandra Constinett. 1970-71. Orientation in American English. Washington, D.C.: Institute of Modern Languages.

Kelly, Louis G. 1969. 25 Centuries of Language Teaching. Rowley Mass.: Newbury House Publishers.

La Forge, Paul. 1971. "Community Language Learning: A Pilot Study," Language Learning 21:45-61.

Lozanov, Georgi. 1973. Suggestology. Sofia, Bulgaria: Nauka I Izkistvo. (Bulgarian).

Mackey, William Francis. 1965. Language Teaching Analysis. London: Longman.

Madsen, Harold S. 1979. "Innovative Methodologies Applicable to TESL" in Celce-Murcia, Marianne and McIntosh, Lois (eds.). Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Maslow, Abraham H. 1962. Toward a psychology of being. New York: Van Nostrand.

Moulton, William G. 1963. "Linguistics and language teaching in the United States: 1940-1960." International Review of Applied Linguistics 1, 1: 21-41.

Newmark, Maxim, ed. 1948. 20th century modern language teaching: Sources and Readings. New York: Philosophical Library.

Palmer, H. E. 1968 (original: 1917). The scientific study and teaching of Languages. David Harper, ed. London: Oxford University Press.

Report of the Committee of Teachers of the Modern Language Association of America. 1900. Boston: D.C. Heath and Company.

Schumann, John. 1972. "Communication techniques," TESOL Quarterly 6: 143-161.

Scovel, Thomas. 1979. "Review: Georgi Lozanov: Suggestology and Outlines of Suggestopedy." TESOL Quarterly 13, 2: 255-266.

Stevick, Earl. 1976. Memory, Meaning and Method. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Titone, Renzo. 1968. Teaching foreign languages: An historical sketch. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Winitz, Harris, and James Reeds. 1973. "Rapid acquisition of a foreign language (German) by the avoidance of speaking," International Review of Applied Linguistics 10: 295-317.